REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Non-Final Office Action dated June 18, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-15 are pending in the current application.

The Examiner indicates that Applicant must make a claim to foreign priority in this application in order to obtain the benefit of priority. Applicant notes that the claim to priority from Korean Application 2000-79354 was properly made in the Request For Priority filed on December 14, 2001. A certified copy of Korean Application 2000-79354 was included with the Request as well. Priority claim is also set forth in paragraph [0001] of the specification as filed.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,221,444 B1 to Okada, et al. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada in view of U.S. Patent 6,469,762 to Hong, et al. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada in view of U.S. Patent 6,295,109 B1 to Kubo, et al. Claims 2, 9, 10 and 13 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The rejections of claims 1 and 3-7 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that this claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a transmittance of the liquid crystal layer for a specific wavelength is changed according to a change of an angle between a light axis of the liquid crystal layer and a transmission axis of the polarizer so that the device can display multiple colors". None of the cited references including Okada, Hong, or

U.S. Application No. 10/014,526 Reply dated September 17, 2003 Reply to Office Action of June 18, 2003

Kubo, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The Examiner alleges that Okada suggests this feature (Office Action, 6/18/2003, page 3, lines 2-6), however, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Okada differs from the present application in that it discusses improving contrast in dark regions. However, by definition, dark regions result from the suppression of the transmittance of all wavelengths light (Okada, column 9, lines 58-66), not of a specific wavelength of light. Therefore, Okada does not teach, disclose or suggest at least this claimed feature of the invention. The Examiner does not allege that Hong and Kubo teach or suggest at least this feature. Applicant submits that Hong and Kubo fail to cure the deficiencies of Okada. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-7, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references at least for the reasons discussed above.

Independent claim 8 is allowable over the cited references in that this claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, "an angle between the light axis and the transmission axis corresponds to voltage between the common and pixel electrodes and is tunable for transmission of a specific wavelength of light". None of the cited references including Okada, Hong, or Kubo, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The Examiner alleges that Okada suggests this feature (Office Action, 6/18/2003, page 3, lines 2-6), however, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Okada discusses contrast in dark regions which by definition result from a suppression the transmittance of all wavelengths light (Okada, column 9, lines 58-66) as discussed above.

Furthermore, Okada is not tunable for or transmission of a specific wavelength of light as required by the claim. Therefore, Okada does not teach, disclose or suggest at least this claimed feature of the invention. The Examiner does not allege that Hong and Kubo teach or suggest at least this feature. Again, Hong and Kubo fail to cure the deficiencies of

U.S. Application No. 10/014,526 Docket No.: 8733.547.00 Reply dated September 17, 2003

Reply to Office Action of June 18, 2003

Okada. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8 and claims 11, 12, 14 and

15, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references at least for the reasons

discussed above.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is

believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is

respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this

application to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for

allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to

discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All

correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office,

then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under

37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete

the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit

any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Date: September 17, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE

Rebecca Goldman Rudich Registration No.: 41,786

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant

Page 4 of 4

DC:50231736.1